

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

SEPTEMBER 20, 2010

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m., Chairman Harold Sanger presiding. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present:

Chairman Harold Sanger
Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative
Craig S. Owens, City Manager
Jim Liberman
Marc Lopata
Ron Reim

Absent:

Scott Wilson

Also Present:

Susan Istenes, Director of Planning & Development Services
Jason Jaggi, Senior Planner
Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney

Chairman Sanger welcomed everyone to the meeting. He asked that all cell phone ringers be turned off or muted and that conversations take place outside the room so as not to disrupt the meeting.

MINUTES

The minutes of the August 16, 2010 meeting were presented for approval. The minutes were approved, after having been previously distributed to each member.

SITE PLAN REVIEW/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – NEW CONSTRUCTION – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE-126 LANCASTER

Paul Doerner, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the proposed project consists of the construction of a new, 4,447 square foot two-story single family residence. The site measures 9,000 square feet and is located in the Clayton Gardens Addition Subdivision. The existing one-story house will be demolished to accommodate the proposed residence. The height of the proposed residence is approximately 27 feet, 5 inches, as measured from the average existing grade to the midpoint of the

roof. The existing site contains 38.37 percent impervious area. The new plans show impervious coverage at 44.77 percent. As required in the Clayton Gardens UDD, impervious coverage does not exceed 30 percent in the front yard or 45 percent of the total lot with a below-grade, side-entry garage. The existing storm water runoff is 0.505 cubic feet per second (cfs). Storm water runoff on the proposed site plan will increase to 0.581 cubic feet per second (a difference of 0.076 CFS). Swales will direct storm water to yard inlets and downspouts will be connected to the storm sewer. Trash will be stored in a brick enclosure adjacent to the side garage entrance and screened by an ornamental black metal gate. The applicant intends to use a geothermal heating and cooling system which will not require exterior mechanical units. However, if a geothermal system is not used, HVAC units will be stored on a concrete pad in the northern side yard. A black ornamental metal fence with a minimum height of 48 inches will serve as a pool barrier for the rear yard pool and will also screen HVAC units and pool equipment. Two Elm trees totaling fifty caliper inches have been determined by a certified arborist to be diseased and dead and will not require replacement. Three flowering ornamental trees currently located in the front yard will be removed. One evergreen tree will be removed and will require replacement. Two street trees will remain and will require adequate protection. A total of 40.5 caliper inches and twelve evergreens are proposed to be planted. Nine broad-leaf evergreen trees totaling 13.5 caliper inches, three large deciduous trees totaling 7.5 caliper inches, twelve flowering ornamental trees totaling 19.5 caliper inches and twelve needled evergreen trees are proposed to be planted. The landscape plan shows some plant material within or very close to the 5-foot utility easement which extends the width of the property in the rear yard. These plantings should be placed outside of the easement so that future access for utilities can be made. Susan indicated that the proposed development represents an increase in impervious coverage and storm water runoff. The site plan provides for storm water mitigation measures by introducing side yard swales, yard drains and connections to the storm sewer to prevent the impact of increased run-off to adjacent properties. Impervious coverage is near the maximum allowance for a below-grade side-entry garage condition. Future requests such as a pool patio expansion or generator pads would result in non-compliance. Street tree protection is a concern, and the City's contracted Landscape Architect should perform an inspection of the tree protection fencing prior to construction activity on the site. Plans indicate that one tree is proposed to be planted in the rear yard easement. The applicant has submitted an addendum showing a pervious paver coach walk connecting to Lancaster Drive rather than the driveway on the subject property. A maintenance and use agreement will be required because of the encroachment of the coach walk into the public right-of-way. Susan stated that staff's recommendation is to approve as submitted with the following conditions:

1. That the City's contracted Landscape Architect perform a site inspection prior to commencement of construction activity to approve the tree protection fencing.
2. That a revised landscape plan be submitted showing trees outside of the side yard swales or rear yard 5 foot easement for staff approval prior to building permit issuance.
3. That a maintenance and use agreement for the front walk in the public right-of-way be approved by the Clayton Public Works Department prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Chairman Sanger asked if impervious coverage will be an issue if the owner decides not to use a geothermal system.

Jason Jaggi indicated that HVAC pads are already included in the drawings should that be the case.

Mr. Doerner stated that staff is very talented and that they attempted to meet the requests and hopes that the structure fits gently on the street.

Chairman Sanger asked Mr. Doerner if the staff recommendations were acceptable.

Mr. Doerner replied “yes”.

Marc Lopata asked how storm water is being mitigated.

Jason Jaggi stated that they will be connecting to the storm sewer and adding swales.

Marc Lopata asked if all rainwater will be captured on the north side.

Jason Jaggi replied “yes”.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Ron Reim and unanimously approved by the members.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

Susan Istenes explained that the proposed home is a beige-painted brick, 4,447 square foot two-story structure located in the Clayton Gardens Addition Subdivision. The applicant indicates that the height of the proposed residence is 27feet, 5 inches, as measured from the average existing grade to the midpoint of the roof. The proposed roof will be charcoal asphalt shingles. Casement clad windows with wood panels will be white in color with black shutters. Trash will be stored in a brick enclosure adjacent to the side garage entrance and screened by an ornamental black metal gate. The applicant intends to use a geothermal heating and cooling system which will not require exterior mechanical units; however, if a geothermal system is not used, HVAC units will be stored on a concrete pad in the northern side yard. A black ornamental metal fence with a minimum height of 48 inches will serve as a pool barrier for the rear yard pool and will also screen HVAC units. The attached, below grade, side entry two-car garage will have white carriage doors. Susan indicated that staff believes the proposed residence meets the requirements of the Clayton Gardens UDD for materials and height mitigation. The height of the proposed structure is stepped down to meet the approximate height of the adjacent one-story residence to the south. The southern side yard setback is increased by 5 feet, 6 inches, and the two-story portion of the proposed structure is set back further from the southern property line. Dormers and sloping roofs minimize the overall scale of the structure. Most homes in the Clayton Gardens neighborhood are constructed of red brick. Clayton Garden UDD requirements state that brick may be painted when compatible with the existing neighborhood. Beige-painted bricks similar to the proposed can be found on two existing homes on the same block as the subject property. Susan indicated that staff recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. Doerner stated that they tried to design a restrained yet dignified structure for the site. Samples of the brick, roofing material (asphalt shingle) and window (white clad) were presented. He stated that the house was stepped down to be compatible with the adjacent one-story house.

Chairman Sanger commented that the house to the right is one of only two ranch-style houses left on the street.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that for the size of the house, this is one of only a few that has successfully mitigated its massiveness. He then complimented the architect.

Chairman Sanger asked the maximum height allowed for this site.

Jason Jaggi replied 30-feet to the mid-point of the roof.

Chairman Sanger asked the height of this structure.

Jason Jaggi replied 27-feet, 5-inches.

Marc Lopata asked if energy efficiency information is provided to applicants.

Jason Jaggi replied “yes”. He stated that a “Resources for Sustainable Development” information sheet is included in the ARB application and on the City’s web-site.

Chairman Sanger commented that this is a nice house.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ron Reim and unanimously approved by the Board.

PUBLIC PARK – CENTENE PLAZA – 7700 FORSYTH BOULEVARD

Dan O’Connor representing The Koman Group (project developer), was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that this is consideration of a request by Dan O’Connor, representing The Koman Group, developer, for review of the design, materials and location for the installation of a public-use park for the Centene Plaza Special Development District. The approved Special Development District (SDD) Sub-District (Phase 1) plan called for the site of the proposed park to be used as a surface parking lot. The parking lot is no longer needed due to the City approving an expansion to the Centene Plaza parking garage. The park will be a temporary use until the Phase 2 portion of the Centene Plaza development is constructed. The site of the proposed park currently exists as a construction staging area. As a change in use from the approved Special Development District (SDD), the applicant will need to request an amendment to the SDD Sub-District Ordinance. According to the City’s Zoning Regulations, the authority to amend the Special Development Sub-District plan rests with the Board of Aldermen. The Architectural Review Board is being requested to review the design and materials of the park prior to the applicant seeking approval of the amended SDD Sub-District plan. The park will be bound by the Phase 1 Centene Plaza building to the north, Hanley Road to the east, Carondelet Avenue to the south and a service alley to the west. The park will consist of a grassy area with a chat walkway that divides the park

on a diagonal from the intersection of Hanley Road and Carondelet Avenue to the stairway tower leading up to the Forsyth Court area. This walkway will contain five stone benches for seating along with lighted bollards for visibility at night. The southwest portion of the park will be flat and covered with fescue. Hedges of Arborvitae will line the western edge of the park. A new sidewalk abutting the alley will be installed to provide additional access to the stairway tower. The northeast portion of the park will be covered by earthen berms up to 5 feet in height. The entire northwest portion will be sodded with Zoysia grass. A bamboo hedge will line the northern edge of the park to screen the Centene Plaza building wall. Storm water on the proposed park site will run southward. A bio-retention area incorporating three new Red Maple trees will be located near the southwest corner of the proposed park to collect runoff from the flat portion of the park. A second bio-retention area will be located near the southeast corner of the park to collect runoff from the elevated portions of the park via a swale running alongside the walkway. This area extends into the sidewalk area at Carondelet Avenue and Hanley Road. Susan indicated that staff is of the opinion that the proposed park will be a positive use of this site until the Phase 2 office building is constructed. This proposed park will be privately owned, but available for use by the general public. This park will be highly visible because of its prominent Downtown location. The flat portion of the park will provide open space that welcomes pedestrians to enter the park and make full use of the flat, grassy area. The elevated portion of the park will create an interesting visual effect facing Hanley Road. Staff has concerns with two specific elements of the design. The first being the proposed chat material for the internal walkway. Due to the slope of the site, the chat material will have a tendency to wash out. The second concern is the proposed planting bed at the southeast corner of the site. Staff believes that this area should be pulled back to line up with the sidewalk area extending along Hanley Road and therefore, staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- 1) That the planting bed on the southeast corner be reduced to match the sidewalk area facing Hanley Road for staff approval.
- 2) That the applicant install sufficient edging to control the potential run-off of the chat walkway material.
- 3) That the Special Development District Sub-District plan be amended due to the proposed change in use as approved by the Board of Aldermen prior to the start of construction.

Chairman Sanger asked what is involved with the Sub-District Plan. He asked if the changes are coming before this Board or if they just go before the Board of Aldermen.

Susan Istenes informed the members that the amendments will go to the Board of Aldermen as it is a change to the Ordinance.

Mr. O'Connor began a PowerPoint presentation. He stated that the subject area for the park is formerly known as the south service lot, located at the southeast corner of the site. A slide depicting a colored site plan (including the park) was presented. Mr. O'Connor explained that the park will feature 5-foot tall berms.

Slides depicting a close-up view of the proposed park, proposed planting plan and photos of the proposed plantings were presented.

Chairman Sanger voiced his confusion with regard to the sidewalk along Hanley Road.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the issues pertaining to the changes to the sidewalk along Hanley Road took place.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if a portion of their property is split by the property line.

Mr. O'Connor replied "yes". He stated that the east edge of the property line is the planter wall.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the sidewalk width will remain as Phase 2 is developed.

Mr. O'Connor stated that Phase 2 will be designed per the streetscape plan.

Chairman Sanger asked if the 12' width of the sidewalk next to the park will remain when Phase 2 gets developed.

Mr. O'Connor replied "yes".

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if water will drain onto the sidewalk. He stated that the contours curve back toward the north and as such, water will flow over the sidewalk which could prove to be a hazard in the wintertime.

Mr. O'Connor stated that most water goes into the ground and excess goes to the swale.

Chairman Sanger stated that it appears water will flow over the sidewalk.

Mr. O'Connor indicated that some water will wash over the sidewalk during rain, but no more than on any sidewalk during rain.

Steve Lichtenfeld agreed that rain water should drain to the soil.

Marc Lopata asked if the sidewalk is concrete.

Mr. O'Connor replied "yes".

Marc Lopata commented that there is not a lot of grass there and that maybe the berms should be relocated so there is less water. He stated that another concern would be kids using the area to ride their bicycles.

Mr. O'Connor stated that bicycle riding will be prohibited.

Marc Lopata suggested putting the uprights on the other side of the trees so they do not shine in people's eyes. He also suggested the use of LED lamps. He asked if those lights will be lit from dusk to dawn.

Mr. O'Connor indicated that they can be.

Marc Lopata stated that they would not have to be on from dusk to dawn.

Ron Reim asked about the chat material.

Jason Jaggi stated that chat can be found at Grand Basin near Art Hill.

Chairman Sanger commented that maintenance is required for chat.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and unanimously approved by the Board.

Chairman Sanger thanked the developer for the park; he stated it is a nice park.

Mark Mehlman, developer of The Crescent, stated that he appreciates the park and asked when the project will be completed.

Mr. O'Connor indicated that they hope to have it completed in 4 weeks. He stated that they have to go before the Board of Aldermen for the SDD amendment.

AMENDMENT TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLANS – ADDITION TO SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 8136 STRATFORD DRIVE

Mr. Rocky Finocchiaro, owner, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that this is a request by Rocky Finocchiaro, owner, for review of a change in exterior materials associated with the previously approved construction of a one-story rear entryway addition, a new covered front porch, and the replacement of all existing vinyl siding with HardiPlank fiber cement siding. The Architectural Review Board (ARB) approved the project on May 17, 2010 with the following conditions:

- That the addition contain fiber cement siding and that all of the existing vinyl siding be replaced with fiber cement siding;
- That the modular block walls be Belgard Celtic or equivalent for Architectural Review Board approval.

Susan explained that the inspector stopped the work at the job site after discovering that the contractor was not using fiber cement siding as approved by the ARB. The applicant has installed Smart Side siding, an engineered wood product made by Louisiana Pacific Corporation, to replace existing vinyl siding and as a substitute for HardiPlank fiber cement siding. Smart Side is an engineered wood product made up of wood strands that are coated with a resin binder and compressed. Unlike fiber cement, the Smart Side material has not been previously approved by the Architectural Review Board as a substitute for wood. As such, staff has referred this request to the Board for its review and approval. By letter, the applicant states that the Smart Side material is

more expensive, longer lasting and a superior product to fiber cement siding. The applicant further states that the material has a more attractive finish with deeper wood grain texture, finished and sealed matching corners, eaves and trim. Staff is of the opinion that the appearance of the Smart Side siding is comparable to fiber cement siding in terms of appearance. In terms of equivalent quality, staff has reviewed the warranties for each product. Both offer a limited 50-year warranty on the material. Both products also offer a warranty on the finish (factory applied) with Smart Side containing a 5-year warranty and James Hardie providing a 15-year warranty. Comparing the two, staff believes that the fiber cement product is of a higher quality than the Smart Side product as expressed in the longer warranty of the James Hardie siding. Staff believes that Smart Side is comparable to fiber cement in terms of durability of the material and appearance. With this in mind, staff supports the use of engineered wood products, such as Smart Side, as an alternative to fiber cement or real wood siding and therefore, staff recommends approval of the use of Smart Side engineered wood siding as a substitute for fiber cement siding.

Mr. Finocchairo distributed a sheet depicting color photos of the Smart Side application versus Hardie Plank siding. He stated that the reason for the change is that he understood that an equivalent to Hardie Board fiber cement siding could be used. He stated that this Smart Side material is a good product. He stated that Hardie Board is brittle and the electricians charge extra to cut into it (Hardie Board).

A sample of the Smart Side material that has been out in the rain for 4 weeks and also placed in a bucket of water for 24 hours was distributed as well as a sample of Hardie Board that was in a box of water for 24 hours was distributed. Mr. Finocchairo noted the deterioration of the Hardie Board versus the Smart Side product. He stated that he believes the Smart Side to be equivalent or better product than Hardie Board and additionally, three of his neighbors have complimented the product.

Chairman Sanger asked why the wood composite product would not swell.

Mr. Finocchairo stated that it is treated with a resin product.

Marc Lopata asked if it contains formaldehyde.

Mr. Finocchairo indicated that he did not know.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that the Smart Side looks and sounds okay.

Jason Jaggi indicated that Belgard, which is an acceptable material, as well as Hardie Board (James Hardie) are both brand names. He stated that versa-lok, which is not acceptable, has a similar product as Belgard. He stated that with regard to the proposed product, staff's research has determined that Smart Side has a 5 year finish warranty where Hardie Board has a 15 year finish warranty. He stated that it does look good installed, but the question is if it is appropriate and if it can be used on subsequent projects.

Chairman Sanger suggested the ARB Guidelines be modified to include newly accepted products.

Marc Lopata indicated that some formaldehyde is toxic.

Mr. Finocchairo stated that there is a cancer warning on the Hardie Board web-site.

Jason Jaggi reminded the members that this is a durability and appearance issue.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve the Smart Side product. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and unanimously approved by the Board.

Kevin O'Keefe announced that City staff does not recommend anything to anyone; the question is if the product meets the established standards as set forth.

PARKING STRUCTURE RENOVATION – 211 SOUTH CENTRAL AVENUE

Theodore Dearing, owner, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that this is a request for review of exterior changes to the parking structure located behind the office building at the subject location. The Architectural Review Board (ARB) approved this project on October 1, 2007. The Zoning Regulations stipulate that ARB approvals are valid up to one (1) year unless a building permit is issued. A permit has not been issued and the previous approvals have since expired. The Board of Adjustment granted variances in 2007 to allow a reduction of two (2) off-street parking spaces with reduced stall widths. These variances also expired; however, the Board of Adjustment renewed these approvals at their September 2, 2010 meeting. Susan explained that the applicant has hired a new architect and contractor to revise the plans and intends to begin construction soon. Due to structural issues, the upper parking deck has been removed and the applicant intends to re-stripe the lower level to provide parking for 12 vehicles. The ramp leading up to the upper level will be removed and the exterior brick walls will be repaired. A majority of the structural steel columns which used to support the upper parking deck will be removed. To maintain the structural integrity of the west exterior wall, three (3) diagonal beams will be installed. The applicant is proposing to install a cedar trellis to conceal the support beams. The previous plans called for an aluminum trellis system. Additionally, the support columns and interior walls of the parking garage will be painted. The rear exit door on the second floor will remain. The applicant is proposing to install a wood walkway and stairway leading to the alley. The previous plans provided for a metal stairway and red awning to meet code. The awnings are no longer required in the building code and as such the applicant is not proposing them as part of this application. Susan stated that staff is of the opinion that the proposed plan for the garage structure is similar to the previously approved plan and will bring the property up to an acceptable standard and recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. That all wood used on the stair way and trellises be appropriately stained; and
2. That the interior of the garage, including the structural beams, be painted a neutral color to provide an improved appearance as viewed from the alley.

Mr. Dearing introduced himself, stating that he is not only an owner, but a tenant as well, so he is personally displaced by this. He stated that he has hired a new architect and contractor.

Chairman Sanger asked staff if this property has been cited.

Jason Jaggi replied “yes”.

Marc Lopata asked about maintenance.

Jason Jaggi indicated that maintenance is handled through the annual property maintenance inspection program.

Marc Lopata voiced his concern about the use of wood.

Chairman Sanger asked if steel could be used, as previously proposed.

Mr. Dearing indicated that the contractor and architect have recommended wood.

Steve Lichtenfeld indicated that the use of wood is acceptable to him, although he hopes the inspectors keep an eye on it.

Jason Jaggi stated that the project has already been reviewed for code and found to be acceptable.

Being no further questions or comments, Jim Liberman made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and unanimously approved by the Board.

MODIFICATION TO SIGN ORDINANCE – INSTALLATION OF WALL SIGN – 1 NORTH BRENTWOOD BOULEVARD (SHAW PARK PLAZA)

Tad Edwards and Tom Martin, Benjamin F. Edwards & Co., were in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the applicant is proposing a 50-square foot wall sign to be located on the south side of the Shaw Park Plaza building. The sign will be used to advertise Benjamin F. Edwards & Company, a new occupant on the ground floor of the office building. This space was previously occupied by Bank Midwest. Section 425.040 of the Sign Ordinance regulates the permitted sign areas based on usage and building type. Multi-tenant office buildings containing banks, retail stores or restaurants are permitted one (1) wall sign twelve (12) square feet in area or five percent (5 %) of the front wall area not to exceed 25 square feet. To request a Modification, the Sign Ordinance states the following: *“Where practical difficulties exist in the application of these provisions in regard to the determination of the permitted sign area or locations of permitted signs due to unusual conditions, such as facades that are angled or curved to the front street or streets or land uses which involve substantial accessory uses both inside and outside of buildings and requiring identification or substantial open space or street frontage or a similar unusual condition, the Architectural Review Board shall have the authority to determine the appropriate location, size or number of signs, provided the intent of these regulations is met. No individual sign shall be approved that exceeds the area limits normally permitted a single tenant or building. The Architectural Review Board shall also have authority to allow signs for ground floor tenants to be located above the first (1st) floor ceiling level when such ground floor tenant space is obstructed*

from view by a transit shelter erected on a public right-of-way". The applicant has submitted a letter providing support for the increased sign area. The applicant indicates that the building elevation is so large that it is difficult for drivers and pedestrians to visually locate 25 square feet as allowed by code. The applicant also states that the mass of the building should allow a larger sign and that other signs, such as the Ruth's Chris sign, are allowed to be larger. The applicant also submitted a rendering showing the sign at 25 square feet in conformance with the Sign Ordinance and at 50 square feet, as proposed. In consideration of the Sign Ordinance, modifications should only be granted due to unusual conditions of the building or site. Examples of the 25 square foot size limitation for first floor uses in multi-tenant office buildings includes M & I Bank at the Interco Tower 101 South Hanley Road, PNC Mortgage at 120 South Central Avenue, PNC Bank at 7801 Forsyth Boulevard, and Regions/Morgan Keegan at 8182 Maryland Avenue. The Architectural Review Board granted a modification for the previous tenant at this location, Bank Midwest, allowing the sign to be placed higher on the building than allowed by ordinance. The size of that sign met the code requirement of 25 square feet. Susan indicated that staff does not believe the applicant has identified any unusual conditions with the building or site that would warrant an exception to the ordinance to allow a larger sign. As shown in the rendering, a 25 square foot sign, in compliance with the sign code, would be adequate with considerable exposure from Forsyth and Brentwood Boulevards. This sign would also be similar to other first floor uses in multi-tenant office buildings. Staff is also concerned that approving this request could set a precedent for future requests for larger signs than allowed by code and as such, recommends denial of the request for a modification to the Sign Ordinance.

Mr. Edwards asked the members for help, stating that they have been forced to look for a new location and that they had pressure to relocate to downtown St. Louis, but want to remain in Clayton. He stated that the company began with 3 people and now there are 116 employees and that this is a sixth generation company. He stated that they have also grown from a 3,000 square foot space to 22,500 square feet. He emphasized that they are a financial service company with 10 offices in 7 states, with their headquarters here in Clayton. He then referred to their submittal (which each member received in their agenda packets), explaining the difficulties in seeing the signs, especially the 25 square foot one, from the street. He reminded the members that the large building is over 41,000 square feet.

A sample of a letter was presented to the members. Mr. Edwards stated that a letter only 5-inches taller, the length of a pencil, is all that is needed to go from a 25 square foot sign to a 50 square foot sign, partially due to the length of the company name. He stated that banks and savings and loan companies are allowed 50 square feet and they should be as well, as they are also a financial institution. He indicated that they have vaults, offer deposits and withdrawals and the people can and do walk in off the street. He stated that they believe this sign will be good for Clayton and good for them. He stated that they have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars to remain in Clayton and are asking for this 50 square foot sign. He stated that they believe they will have more offices by year's end.

Chairman Sanger stated that the City is delighted that they are here in Clayton. He asked staff how Ruth Chris received a bigger sign.

Jason Jaggi indicated that restaurants are allowed more signage. He reiterated that staff completely agrees that they should be allowed a sign, the question is how large of a sign they should have as they are only entitled to 25 square feet, per the Sign Ordinance.

Mr. Edwards reiterated that their name is longer.

Jason Jaggi agreed that they are similar to a bank and entitled to a sign; however, if there was no size limit, all tenants would ask for larger signs.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if they had a wall sign now.

Mr. Edwards replied “no”; because the tenant who occupied half of the building had a sign and they did not want to invest in a sign knowing they would be relocating.

Marc Lopata commented that even without a sign they experienced phenomenal growth.

Mr. Edwards agreed.

Marc Lopata asked if there is a dedicated entryway to their new office space.

Jason Jaggi replied “no”; entry is through the lobby. He commented that the Sign Ordinance tries to make distinctions. He stated that the Sign Ordinance allows banks/savings and loans 50 square foot signs if they are attached to another building and that the Ordinance is very specific in that a practical difficulty must exist in order to justify a sign larger than that allowed.

Jim Liberman indicated that this is a unique situation as the sign would be on the second story (higher up on the building) versus the first floor and as such, more difficult to read.

Susan Istenes commented that staff’s position is that the building is very prominent and very visual and that no unusual hardship exists.

Craig Owens stated that the length of the company name presents a challenge and that the grade prevents them from having a separate entrance.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked what other first floor tenant has an entrance off the lobby.

Jason Jaggi indicated that Ruth Chris Restaurant can be entered off the lobby; however, they have a separate entrance as well.

Chairman Sanger asked if their company name will be on the monument sign.

Mr. Martin replied “no”; it is not allowed.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that although he does not like to go against code and set a precedent, and although the building can be seen from a distance, he would prefer a larger sign since it is higher up on the building.

Ron Reim agreed; a larger sign would be more legible.

Being no further questions or comments, Jim Liberman made a motion to approve the sign as proposed, allowing the 50 square foot sign. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and received the following roll call vote: Ayes: Craig Owens, Steve Lichtenfeld, Jim Liberman, Ron Reim. Nays: Chairman Sanger and Marc Lopata. Motion carries.

Ron Reim asked if there was any development news.

Craig Owens commented that Centene believes Phase 2 will begin in about 18 months.

Marc Lopata complimented City staff on the City's "green" page on the web-site. He asked the status of the storm water and landscaping regulations.

Jason Jaggi stated that staff is still working on them. He stated that he hopes to have some guidelines for solar panels wind energy panels to present to the Board in October.

Jim Liberman asked how long the west lane of Hanley Road at the Centene development will be closed.

Craig Owens stated that a sidewalk issue came up; it ended up being narrower than originally approved and that plan adjustments are being considered.

Ron Reim asked how much narrower.

Chairman Sanger replied about 22-inches.

Jason Jaggi indicated that in one area, there is only 26-inch sidewalk surface width (not counting the brick banding); resulting in about one foot narrower than the approved plan (approved plan was 3 feet width).

Craig Owens commented that fire truck access off Carondelet is an issue as well.

Chairman Sanger advised that he may not be in attendance at the October 4th PC/ARB meeting and would like Jim Liberman to Chair for him if needed.

Craig Owens informed the other members that the Downtown Master Plan was not adopted by the Board of Aldermen.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that there are several areas of the document that they want to look at again.

Chairman Sanger asked about the Wydown Middle School Project.

Susan Istenes informed the members that the project was submitted for initial staff review today and the plans will be reviewed (by staff) this Thursday.

Ron Reim asked about the approval process.

Kevin O'Keefe stated that the project is not subject to the same review and approval process as other projects as it is a public school project. He stated that even if the Planning Commission denies the project, they can still proceed so long as they have the majority vote (2/3) of the governing body, which is the School Board.

Marc Lopata asked if they must comply with life/safety issues.

Kevin O'Keefe replied "yes".

Marc Lopata asked if a vote on the site plan will take place.

Kevin O'Keefe replied "yes" and that your vote (recommendation) will be forwarded to the School Board.

Being no further business for the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board, this meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Recording Secretary